

- Quicke, D.L.J. & van Achterberg, C. 1990. The type specimens of Enderlein's Braconinae (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) housed in Warsaw. *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie*, **133**: 251–264.
- Simbolotti, G. & van Achterberg, C. 1990. Revision of the *Euagathis* species (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) from Sulawesi. *Zoologische Verhandelingen, Leiden*, **256**: 1–35.
- Tobias, V.I. 1986. Opredelitel nasekomykh evropeiskoi tsasmi SSSR, vol. 3 (Hymenoptera), part 4. *Opredeliteli po Faune SSR, Izdavaemye Zoologicheskim Muzeem*, **145**: 1–501.
- Tobias, V.I. 1989. Die Braconidae des europäische Teils der UdSSR. Pp. 278–279 in: *Verhandlungen IX SIEEC, Gotha, 1986*.
- Tobias, V.I. & Potopova, E.S. 1987. Labiomaksilljarnij kompleks brakonid (Hymenoptera, Braconidae), ego evoljutsija i taksonomitseskoe znatsenie. *Trudy Vsesoyuznogo Entomologicheskogo Obshchestva*, **69**: 190–208.

(2) Michael J. Sharkey

Biosystematics Research Centre, K.W. Neathy Building, C.E.F. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6

I write in support of the application by Wharton & Mason to maintain the current usage of *Cremnops* Foerster, 1862. I have been publishing on various taxa within the AGATHIDINAE, including *Cremnops*, for about 10 years and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. I am therefore concerned that the name *Vipio* Latreille, 1804, long established in the BRACONINAE, may be transferred to the AGATHIDINAE to replace *Cremnops*.

This would serve no purpose other than to confuse the literature of the two subfamilies and indeed to confuse the identity of the genus *Vipio*.

Comment on the need for stability in fish family-group names

(See BZN 47: 97–100, 138, 295–296; 48: 147–148)

John R. Paxton & Jeffrey M. Leis

Division of Vertebrate Zoology, Australian Museum, 6–8 College Street, Sydney, New South Wales 2000, Australia

We agree with Wheeler (BZN 47: 97–100) that family names are important and see merit in his call for an international committee to consider the grammatically correct forms proposed by Steyskal (1980). We are also in agreement with Olson (BZN 47: 296) on the value of grammatically correct names.

We are in total disagreement with Randall's recommendation (BZN 47: 295) that all of these spellings be rejected. While Randall cites his comprehensive book (Randall, Allen & Steene, 1990) as one not using the emended names, we can cite ours (Leis & Trnski, 1989; Paxton, Hoese, Allen & Hanley, 1989) as books that do.

The important point is that the emended names are being used validly under the Code by many in the ichthyological community, and cannot be ignored or subjectively dismissed. Nor should the issue of the use of these emended names be decided by assembling lists of publications either using or not using them. A case for changing the Code to deal with such emended names so as to avoid controversy and potential confusion could be argued, but in the present situation this would very much be a case of 'closing the barn door after the horse had bolted'.

Additional references

- Leis, J.M. & Trnski, T. 1989. *The larvae of Indo-Pacific shorefishes*. 371 pp. New South Wales University Press, Sydney.
- Paxton, J.R., Hoese, D.F., Allen, G.R. & Hanley, J.E. 1989. *Zoological catalogue of Australia*, part 7 (Pisces Petromyzontidae to Carangidae). 665 pp. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Randall, J.E., Allen, G.R. & Steene, R.C. 1990. *Fishes of the Great Barrier Reef and Coral Sea*. 507 pp. Crawford House Press, Bathurst.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Acanthopthalmus* van Hasselt in Temminck, 1824 (Osteichthyes, Cypriniformes) with *Cobitis kuhlii* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1846 as the type species
(Case 2738; see BZN 47: 118–121; 48: 59–65)

(1) Rohan Pethiyagoda

The Wildlife Heritage Trust of Sri Lanka, 36/2 Castle Street, Colombo 8, Sri Lanka

I have read the observations of Ng, Munro & Lim and Kottelat (BZN 48: 59–62) on the application by BurrIDGE, Siebert & Ferraris. I have also read the arguments of Siebert and of Hieronimus, Schmidt & Steinle (BZN 48: 63–64). While being in complete agreement with the views expressed by Kottelat and Ng et al. I wish to draw the attention of the Commission to some broader issues which I feel it should take into consideration in deciding this case.

1. After many decades of neglect the fishes of South and Southeast Asia are now again receiving the attention of ichthyologists. The most recent technical literature on much of the oriental ichthyofauna is more than a century old. Many areas of this geographically and politically complex region are, or until recently have been, difficult to access and work in. However, during the past decade a few workers have been successful in penetrating some of the more remote areas and making useful studies; M. Kottelat and T.R. Roberts are notable in this respect. It is evident from the publications of Kottelat (1989, 1990) and Roberts (1989) that the information available in the literature on the fishes of this region up to now has been far from accurate and certainly not complete. A great deal of revisionary work is required, and much work is already in progress. These revisions have resulted, and will continue to result, in many fundamental changes to the nomenclature. I have shown (Pethiyagoda, 1991) that of the primary freshwater fishes of Sri Lanka the names of some 30% of the taxa have changed from the most recent revision (1955). The replacement of *Acanthopthalmus* van Hasselt in Temminck, 1824 by *Pangio* Blyth, 1860 has not caused 'considerable confusion' as alleged by BurrIDGE et al. and is unlikely to do so in any way. If this were the case any taxonomic revision would be futile. I cannot conceive of any competent taxonomist being confused by the recommendation of Kottelat (1987); not even the chaotic alpha-level taxonomy of the minor Asiatic cyprinids seems to have caused 'considerable confusion'.

2. Contrary to the view adopted by BurrIDGE et al. many of the more responsible catalogues and guides do take particular pride in ensuring that they adopt the most up-to-date nomenclature. As Ng et al. have pointed out, changes in the generic placement of commonly exploited fishes such as *Poecilia reticulata* and *Sarotherodon mossambicus*